TED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 APR 2 1 2008 FILING DATE ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR 10/761,218 01/22/2004 Bruce Babashan 21782.00 2750 37833 04/18/2008 7590 **EXAMINER** LITMAN LAW OFFICES, LTD. P.O. BOX 15035 EVANISKO, GEORGE ROBERT **CRYSTAL CITY STATION** PAPER NUMBER ARLINGTON, VA 22215 3762 MAIL DATE DELIVERY MODE 04/18/2008 **PAPER** 

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/761,218	BABASHAN, BRUCE
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	George R. Evanisko	3762
The MAILING DATE of this communication of Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a rep- iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH attute, cause the application to become ABAI	ATION.  ly be timely filed  IS from the mailing date of this communication.  NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28     This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ T     Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	his action is non-final. wance except for formal matter	-
Disposition of Claims		
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6, 15-20 is/are wit 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-14 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	hdrawn from consideration.	
Application Papers	,	
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the containing the oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyand rection is required if the drawing(s	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). ) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bur  * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ents have been received. ents have been received in Appriority documents have been received in Appriority documents have been received.	plication No eceived in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Sui	mmary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/	Mail Date ormal Patent Application

Art Unit: 3762

## **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of the wrist watch embodiment in the reply filed on 1/28/08 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that a search and examination of the entire application could be accomplished without a serious burden on the Examiner is not persuasive since the wrist watch embodiment and stand-up exercise embodiment have two divergent searches. In addition, the applicant has not stated on the record that the embodiments are obvious variants of each other. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 6 and 15-20 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected embodiment, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 1/28/08.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geneen (3978849) in view of Havel (6690343). Geneen discloses the claimed invention as a wristwatch with digital display and using colors to indicate heart rate (e.g. figure 5, col 5) with the display over substantially the entire top surface and the use of a microcontroller as the circuitry in the

wristwatch, but does not disclose the color is over the entire top surface or in the alternative, specifically use the term microcontroller. Havel teaches that it is known to have the entire background display display a color representing a measured value so the wearer can quickly and easily evaluate the measured condition. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate into the wrist watch display device as taught by Geneen the use of the entire background display displaying a color representing a measured value to provide a wrist watch with the entire background display displaying a color representing a measured value to provide the predictable results of allowing the wearer to quickly and easily evaluate the measured condition. In addition, it would have been obvious to include in Geneen and Havel a microcontroller to have the heart rate algorithm programmed in since it was known in the art that wrist watch devices use a microcontroller with a heart rate algorithm programmed in to provide the predictable results of a low power, small circuit to control the system.

Claims 2-5, 7, and 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geneen in view of Havel (modified Geneen) as applied to claims 1 and 8 above. Modified Geneen discloses the claimed invention except for the case with radially contacts and rotating bezel to operate as a user variable input device to select user variables such as age, gender, height, etc, for a user variable display, and the use of the Karvonen formula to change the heart rate colors, using such colors as green, blue, red, yellow, and black to indicate the different heart rate ranges. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the wrist watch measuring device as taught by modified Geneen, with the case with radially contacts and rotating bezel to operate as a user variable input device

Art Unit: 3762

to select user variables such as age, gender, height, etc, for a user variable display, and the use of the Karvonen formula to change the heart rate colors, using such colors as green, blue, red, yellow, and black to indicate the different heart rate ranges since it was known in the art that wrist watch measuring devices use: a case with radially contacts and rotating bezel to operate as a user variable input device to select user variables such as age, gender, height, etc, for a user variable display to provide the predictable results of the appearance of a normal watch that will allow the user to easily enter and visually acknowledge variables that are entered into the heart rate algorithm to allow the algorithm to be based on the particular patient to correctly indicate the patients heart rate condition; and the use of the Karvonen formula to change the heart rate colors, using such colors as green, blue, red, yellow, and black to indicate the different heart rate ranges, to provide the predictable results of a conventional, well known formula to accurately determine the patients optimal heart range for exercise, etc (in addition, as applicant points out on page 3 of their specification, this is a well known formula). Finally, the use of the different colors for the different ranges are not considered to be novel and unobvious over the prior art since it is well known to use different particular colors for different particular heart rate ranges and that the choice of the particular color for the range is an obvious design choice that does not patentably distinguish over the prior art. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with the different color range as taught by modified Geneen in view of one having ordinary skill in the art, because it effectively indicates the patients heart rate range with color.

Application/Control Number: 10/761,218

Art Unit: 3762

# Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by amendment.

#### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Narayanaswami and Nissilaet are examples of a user entered input device. Havel, 4647217, and Nissila are other examples of a color coded heart rate display.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George R. Evanisko whose telephone number is 571 272 4945. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on 571 272 4955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George R Evanisko/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 3762

GRE 4/14/08

# Notice of References Cited Application/Control No. 10/761,218 Examiner George R. Evanisko Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination BABASHAN, BRUCE Art Unit Page 1 of 1

# **U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS**

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
*	Α	US-6,556,222	04-2003	Narayanaswami, Chandrasekhar	715/786
*	В	US-6,745,069	06-2004	Nissil.ang. et al.	600/523
*	С	US-2002/0068873	06-2002	Nissila, Seppo	600/509
*	D	US-4,647,217	03-1987	Havel, Karel	368/10
*	E	US-3,978,849	09-1976	Geneen, Harold S.	600/503
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	Н	US-			
	1	US-			
	J	US-			
	К	US-			
	L	US-			
	М	US-		·.	

#### FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	Ν					
	0					
	Р					
	Q				÷	
	R				,	
	s					
	Т					

## NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	
	٧	
	w	
	×	

\*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).) Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-892 (Rev. 01-2001)

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 If Undeliverable Return in Ten Days

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER





Leave the second second